



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,472	05/10/2001	Paul O. Sheppard	97-28C1	6027

7590 01/29/2004

Paul G. Lunn, Esq.  
ZymoGenetics, Inc.  
1201 Eastlake Avenue East  
Seattle, WA 98102

EXAMINER

PAK, MICHAEL D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	1646

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/852,472	SHEPPARD ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael Pak	1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 16-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 16-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 10-14463
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendments filed 24 September 2003 has been entered. Claims 1-15 have been cancelled. Claims 16-34 are pending.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Applicant's arguments filed 24 September 2003 have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

4. Claims 16-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a substantial asserted utility or a well established utility.

The reasons for the rejection has been set forth in the previous office action.

Applicants argue that Zneu1 polypeptides of the present invention would be useful "in angiogenesis" due to Znue1's association and structural similarities with the endothelial-specific gene Notch 4. However, Zneu1 polypeptide is an orphan polypeptide whose function has not been elucidated. Applicants assert the divergent therapeutic utility on pages 28-30 of the specification varying from Alzheimer's disease, cancer and fertility in testes. The specification does not disclose the asserted utility of using Zneu1 polypeptide for angiogenesis. Furthermore, the specification on page 28

(lines 11-12) teaches that Zneu1 may have nothing to do with Notch and many proteins have EGF repeats. The claimed polypeptides do not have substantial utility because different growth factors with similar homology have different functions and the a skilled artisan would have to determine the function of the growth factor. The polypeptide lacks substantial utility because further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use is required. Thus, the asserted utility lacks substantial and specific utility because further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use is required. *Brenner V. Manson* 383 U.S. 519, 535-536, 148 USPQ 689, 696 (1966) stated that "Congress intended that no patents be granted on an chemical compound whose sole "utility" consists of its potential role as an object of use-testing ... a patent is not a hunting license." *Brenner* further states that "It is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion." Any utility of the nucleic acid encoding the protein or other specific asserted utility is directly dependent on the function of the protein. A circular assertion of utility is created where the utility of the protein is needed to break out the circular assertion of utility. The polypeptides do not substantial utility because the skilled artisan would need to prepare, isolate, and analyze the protein in order to determine its functional nexus with human therapeutics. Therefore, the invention is not in readily available form. Instead, further experimentation of the protein itself would be required before it could be used. The disclosed use for the nucleic acid molecule of the claimed invention is generally applicable to any nucleic acid and therefore is not particular to the nucleic acid sequence claimed. The vectors and

host cells do not have utility because the nucleic acid without utility is needed to practice the inventions.

Claims 16-34 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 18, 21, 24, and 28-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The newly submitted claims 18, 21, 24, and 30 recite the term "immunoglobulin domain" which is new matter because the specification does not disclose the claimed invention. Claims 28-34 recite or encompass the specific residues of SEQ ID NO:3 which is new matter because the specification does not disclose the claimed invention.

6. No claims are allowed.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pak, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0879. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 2:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler, can be reached on (571) 272-0871.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Application/Control Number: 09/852,472  
Art Unit: 1646

Page 6

Michael Pak  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1646  
21 January 2004